

"This was done because it was necessary to settle which of the twenty-six Anglo-American colonies—of which thirteen only were included in the treaties—were referred to, but it was the independence of the United States as one power, not that of the States separately, which was acknowledged. France and the United States, in the French treaty, are spoken of as the two parties to its stipulations, and Great Britain, in like manner, treats with the United States as the only party recognized by her in the negotiation. The American negotiators received their appointment and credentials, not from the separate States, but from the Congress. They had no commissions from the separate States, and they were not in any way deputed or instructed by them, nor by any one of them; nor was any one of the separate States in any way, directly or indirectly, represented in the negotiations. Neither of these treaties was referred to the separate States for ratification, as of course they would have been if their separate and independent sovereignty had been recognized; but like all other treaties under the old Confederation, they required not even the unanimous ratification of the States in Congress. The concurrence of nine States only was necessary for the ratification of a treaty, a circumstance which of itself shows that their separate and independent sovereignty could not have been recognized. What sort of a separate and independent sovereignty is a member of a Confederation, which is not only declared by its articles incompetent to send an embassy or enter into any treaty with a foreign power without the consent of Congress, but upon which any treaty with a foreign power might be imposed against its consent by nine out of thirteen States?"

I have read from an article recently contributed by Edward Everett to the *New York Ledger*.

Now, what becomes of the sovereignty of the States, according to this high commentary, according to the definition which I have read from a conceded law authority, and according to the ordinary understanding of the word "sovereignty?" What becomes of the sovereignty of the State, thus shorn of the greatest possible attribute of sovereignty which it could enjoy, the power of being recognized as a nation by another nation? A nation to exist, a sovereignty to exist, which has no reputation, no character, no status among the family of nations of the earth? I cannot believe that such a doctrine can be seriously entertained, although I have no doubt that gentlemen who advance it do so in all earnestness.

This is a sort of skirmish in which I am engaged, for I have not formed any general plan of argument. I pass to the gentleman from Somerset, (Mr. Jones,) who indulged in the same course of argument; and

what I have already said will apply to the view which he presented upon this same point.

But the gentleman from Somerset, (Mr. Jones,) if I correctly understood him in the course of his argument, went a little further upon another branch of the subject. He boldly challenged the House to produce the authority of any living statesman, of any statesman of the past, of any statesman contemporaneous with the ratification of the Constitution, who had pretended to dispute the doctrine of State rights.

Mr. JONES, of Somerset. I said, who had asserted the doctrine of paramount allegiance to the Federal Government.

Mr. RIDGELY. The one is a *sequitur* of the other; they are inseparably connected with each other. National sovereignty involves paramount allegiance: State sovereignty rejects it. I was prepared at the time, but did not propose to interrupt my honorable friend in the course of his argument, to refer him to various authorities upon the subject. But I have one at hand in this same paper, from this same author; one that covers the whole of that ground. I think I can refer the gentleman to one of the brightest lights of his day; I think I can refer him to a man in South Carolina, greater than whom South Carolina has not produced a son, who in the State Convention of South Carolina about to pass upon this very Constitution, replied to this very same theory of State sovereignty. I refer to General Charles Cotesworth Pinckney, the one name that stands by all confession at the head of the statesmen of that State of his day. He avowed "that the Declaration of Independence itself sufficiently refuted the doctrine of the individual sovereignty and independence of the several States." He goes on to say that, "in that declaration the States are not even enumerated. * * * The separate independence and individual sovereignty of the several States were never thought of by the enlightened band of patriots who framed this declaration; the several States are not even mentioned by name in any part, as if it were intended to impress this maxim on America, that our freedom and independence arose from our Union, and that without it we could neither be free nor independent."

Mr. CHAMBERS. Will the gentleman allow me to interrupt him?

Mr. RIDGELY. Certainly, with pleasure.

Mr. CHAMBERS. Does not the Declaration of Independence say—"We, therefore, the representatives of America in General Congress assembled, * * * solemnly publish and declare, that these united colonies"—these colonies—"are, and of right ought to be, free and independent States?"

Mr. RIDGELY. That is true. And the interpretation of the commentator from whom I am reading is that the term "united colonies" is a collective word, used to designate